



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,454	07/21/2003	Steven M. Casey	020366-089500US	5591

20350 7590 07/24/2008
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VAN KIM T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/624,454	Applicant(s) CASEY ET AL.	
	Examiner Van Kim T. Nguyen	Art Unit 2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on July 7, 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to communications filed on July 7, 2008.

Claims 1-46 are pending in the application.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 7, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 1-8, 12, 17, 21-25, 27, 32, 35-37, 39 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore, Jr. et al, hereinafter Moore (US 7,035,270), in view of Bhogal et al, hereinafter Bhogal (US 7,248,563)

Regarding claims 1, 22 and 35, Moore discloses a network interface device (30) comprising:

an isolation device adapted to isolate a transport medium internal to a customer premises from a transport medium external to the customer premises such that operational changes to one of the internal and external transport media do not affect the other of the internal and external transport media (e.g., home network interface 32 containing appropriate physical layers and interface, e.g., antenna, RJ-11 connection, power system connection that operational changes to the internal and external transport media do not affect the other of the internal and external transport media; col. 3: lines 44-47);

a first interface coupled with the isolation device and adapted to communicate with the external transport medium, wherein the external transport medium is in communication with a distribution point (interface 38, 42, 62; col. 3: lines 53-67);

a second interface coupled with the isolation device and adapted to communicate with the internal transport medium (main bus 34; col. 3: lines 44-47); and

a microserver disposed external to the customer premises and coupled with the first and second interfaces, wherein the microserver is adapted to receive telecommunication information from the external transport medium and includes software for implementing at least one of an authentication microserver, a file-transfer microserver, a dynamic host configuration protocol microserver, or a webserver microserver to function over the internal transport medium by processing the received telecommunication information (HNG 30 controls access to MSO-based services which includes audio/video entertainment and Internet access and obtains NMS/EMS authorization and authentication information to allow subscribers access to web services,

Art Unit: 2152

inherently by implementing at least a webserver or an authentication server; col. 5: lines 36 –col. 6: line 24).

Moore does not explicitly call for the isolation device adapted to provide communications security by preventing a microserver from accessing communications information which is associated with another microserver.

Bhogal teaches the isolation device adapted to provide communications security by preventing a microserver from accessing communications information which is associated with another microserver (e.g., blocking a specified computer from accessing the network; col. 3: lines 15-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Bhogal's method of restricting access to a network in Moore's system, motivated by the need to strengthen network security.

Regarding claim 2, Moore-Bhogal also discloses the isolation device and microserver are disposed within a common housing (Moore; Figure 2).

Regarding claim 3, Moore-Bhogal also discloses the common housing (30) is disposed on an exterior wall of the customer premises (Moore; Figure 3).

Regarding claims 4 and 23, Moore-Bhogal also discloses an addressable application device coupled with the microserver, wherein the addressable application device is adapted to receive the processed telecommunication information and to execute a defined application as an

aid to implementing the microserver functions over the internal transport medium (DSP 50 emulates PCM highway to communicate with SLIC 36 and in-home network interface 32 to distribute telephone signals and other signals throughout the home network; Moore, col. 4: lines 13-25).

Regarding claim 5, Moore-Bhogal also discloses the addressable application device is disposed external to the customer premises (Moore, Figure 3).

Regarding claim 6, Moore-Bhogal also discloses the isolation device, microserver, and addressable application device are disposed within a common housing (Moore, Figure 2).

Regarding claims 7, 24 and 36, Moore-Bhogal also discloses the authentication microserver is adapted to verify that the microserver functions are authorized for the customer premises (Moore, col. 6: lines 1-6).

Regarding claims 8, 25 and 37, Moore-Bhogal also discloses the file-transfer microserver is adapted to transfer an electronic file of information to or from the network interface device (retrieve configuration files and upload the files to a specific device for configuration or other purposes; Moore, col. 5: lines 64-67).

Regarding claims 12, 27 and 39, Moore-Bhogal also discloses the microserver comprises a code-processing microserver adapted to receive code and process the code for use by another

component of the network interface device (conversion functionality needed to convert digital signal from DSP 50 into analog telephone is implemented in dongle 58; Moore, col. 4: lines 21-40).

Regarding claims 17, 32 and 44, Moore-Bhogal also discloses the microserver comprises a wireless microserver adapted to provide an interface between wireless communications within the customer premises to the external transport medium (RF connector 44 or antenna 62; Moore, Figure 2).

Regarding claim 21, Moore-Bhogal also discloses upgradeable firmware that supports the microserver (home network interface 32 can be in the form of a plug-in card connected to main bus 34; Moore, col. 3: lines 44-47. Thus, if new and improved interface card is available, the system can be upgraded).

6. Claims 9-11, 13-16, 18-20, 26, 28, 30, 33-34, 38, 40, 42 and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore-Bhogal as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Rakib (US 6,970,127).

Regarding claims 9-11, 26 and 38, Moore-Bhogal discloses substantially all the claimed limitations, except a dynamic host configuration protocol microserver adapted to manage an internet-protocol address assignment to a device coupled with the internal transport medium.

As shown in Figure 8, Rakib teaches a home gateway comprising a DHCP server 320 assigns addresses to clients on the LAN and in the gateway (col. 27: lines 16-17; Figure 8).

Obviously, internet-protocol address assignment can either be public or private address assignment.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Rabik's method of using a DHCP server in Moore-Bhogal's system in order to access, control and monitor the gateway remotely.

Regarding claims 13, 28 and 40, Moore-Bhogal-Rakib also teaches the webserver microserver adapted to render a display of incoming web page information suitable for presentation with a web-browser enabled device (a web server application 340 controls host computer 308 to serve web pages to browsers on the internet (Rabik; col. 31: lines 8-10).

Regarding claims 15, 30 and 42, Moore-Bhogal-Rakib also teaches the microserver comprises an instant-messenger microserver adapted to provide instant-messaging functionality over the internal transport medium (Rabik; col. 23: lines 13-17).

Regarding claim 16, Rakib also teaches the microserver comprises:

a webserver microserver adapted to render a display of web-page information suitable for presentation with a web-browser enabled device (Rabik; col. 31: lines 25-38); and

an advertising microserver adapted to overlay an advertisement over the display of web-page information (Rabik; col. 22: lines 63-67)

Regarding claims 18, 33 and 45, Moore-Bhogal-Rakib also teaches the microserver comprises an RF power-level microserver adapted to monitor an RF power level of telecommunication information received at the first interface (e.g., rate shaping circuitry 11 to change the data rate of data transmitted to or received from headend 12 over transmission medium 12; Rabik; col. 6: lines 33-60).

Regarding claim 19, Moore-Bhogal-Rakib also teaches the microserver comprises a test-access microserver adapted to verify proper functioning of another component of the network interface device (gateway 12 has intelligent hub management software that monitors traffic conditions and does whatever management and rate shaping is necessary to most efficiently use the LAN resources 28 and broadband 14 that are available; Rabik; col. 7: lines 63-67).

Regarding claims 20, 34 and 46, Moore-Bhogal-Rakib also teaches a webserver microserver coupled with the microserver and adapted to provide a customer-based graphical user interface for implementing software configuration changes of the microserver (Moore-Bhogal; col. 5: lines 60-67 and Rabik; col. 31: lines 25-38).

7. Claims 14, 29 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore-Bhogal as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Johnson et al (US 5,694,616).

Regarding claim 14, Moore-Bhogal discloses substantially all the claimed limitations, except initiating an email alert in response to receipt of an email at an email account.

Johnson et al teaches initiating an alert in response to receipt of an email message at an email account (col. 3: lines 16-18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Johnson's method of notifying the receiving of email in Moore-Bhogal's system in order to provide receivers with a friendly user email product that alerts users with receiving messages.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Van Kim T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3073. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/624,454
Art Unit: 2152

Page 10

Van Kim T. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2152

vkn

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152